



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## RECENT DECISIONS

**BAIL—ERROR TO DENY MOTION TO UNDO FORFEITURE OF BAIL OF ONE CIVILLY DEAD.**—The defendant was arrested in North Dakota for carrying a concealed weapon. His wife deposited a cash bail for his appearance in court, whereby, he was released. When the time for his appearance occurred he was in the penitentiary of another State, under a sentence for life on a charge and conviction of bank robbery. Hence, upon his failure to appear, the court declared the forfeiture of the bail money. The defendant and his wife made a motion to vacate the forfeiture. *Held*, forfeiture vacated. *State v. Williams* (N. D. 1922), 189 N. W. 625.

Obviously, the spirit of the law in regard to the point here involved is to discharge the surety upon a bail for any action by the State prejudicing the rights of the surety, without his knowledge and consent. *Cooper v. State* (1879), 5 Tex. Ct. App. 215, 32 Am. Rep. 571. Likewise, the surety will be discharged if the principal, having given bond to appear before the United States court in one district, is with the consent of that court, removed for trial under an indictment in another district. *In re Beavers* (1904), 131 Fed. 366. And, in *People v. Bartlett* (1842), 3 Hill (N. Y.) 570, it was held to be a good defense to an action against sureties on a recognizance that at the time the principal should have appeared before the court, that he was in jail in another county in the same State, upon a criminal charge. For the same holding see, *State v. Funk* (1910), 20 N. D. 145, 127 N. W. 722, 30 L. R. A. (N. S.) 211, cited in the opinion of the court as authority for the decision in the instant case.

The law does not regard the action of another State as favorable to the release of sureties on a bail bond, as it does the action of the State in which the bail bond is given. Thus, in direct conflict with the instant case, it has been held that if the performance of a recognizance be rendered impossible by the imprisonment of the principal in another State, it does not discharge bail. *King v. State* (1885), 18 Neb. 375, 25 N. W. 519; *Yarbrough v. Commonwealth* (1889), 89 Ky. 151, 12 S. W. 143; *Taylor v. Taintor* (1872), 83 U. S. 366, 21 L. Ed. 287.

The reason for the decision reached in the instant case seems clearly attributable to the fact that the court regarded the defendant as civilly dead; and regarded civil death equivalent to natural death, as a release of bail bond.

**CHATTEL MORTGAGES—SUPERIOR TO SUBSEQUENT LIENS FOR REPAIRS, STORAGE AND THE LIKE.**—The owner of a truck, gave the plaintiff a chattel mortgage on said truck, retaining same in his possession. Later the truck was delivered by the owner to the defendant for repairs, the defendant being in the general garage and automobile repair business. The plaintiff knew of this arrangement but made no objection to it. The defendant made the required repairs and stored the truck for some time;